11/20/70

Dear Paul,

It is not my purpose to harrangue you, for I know how much the captive you are of a fierce and (to me) unreasoning determination. However, there is something not directly related to your thing but also inseparable from it that, if only elliptically, I feel I should communicate to you. Whether or not you heed it, whether or not you now can do anything about it if you would, I do not know. However, I do the one thing I can, with the strictures I feel necessary for a number of reasons, one being renewed interest in my correspondents by others than those addressed. Five days of letters recently reached a nearby correspondent at one time, in a single mail delivery. Things like that.

The state of my knowledge of the basic raw material of your work is now such that I can assure you it contains what it has always been reported not to contain by way of timing. Exactly what is official said not to be there most assuredly is and we have been able to extract it by an extension of the first and very primitive thing I did when I got permission to use my Bolex projector on the 8mm. This machine is safe at 5 fps-and clear, too, which is not relevant here. So, if you are not other than the man I think I know, I think that any attention to this thing will be something that will become a rather serious problem for you with the passing of time. I have been intending to write you this for a few weeks but think it slipped my slipping mind.

The quality of my materials is such that I have prints that will not fit into even a legal-sized filing cabinet. And clear, too. And, there is an added and I think significant excisions. Here I am not talking about what one can deduce from Fred's generation. There is a vast generation-gap between us. If you recall my writing on efforts at timing in PM, that and this coincide. Which may explain what I might call, in a light moment, the Dolce vita.

So, if by some arcane science beyond my limited comprehension, you believe you have established that 5+5=7, it remains a fact, without benefit of such skills, that 2+2 still equal four and any 5+5 computations are irrelevant save for purpose that cannot be reputable and scientific.

Believe me or not, I tell it as it is.

You have been silent about my 399 challenge, asking you to defend your inconceivable statement you can accept its career. Let me be more specific and do this in terms of any thoracic fragmentation, the fact of which <u>is</u> established (and I invite disproof from you) in PMIII.

Your record tells me you eschew direct challenges. So be it. But they have a way of mimicing the ghost in Hamlet. Meanwhile, I tell you what I feel I should.

Best,